

November 3, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Daniel S. Collins, Acting Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: G. Edward Miller, Project Engineer /RA/  
Project Directorate I, Section 2  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2,  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION (RAI) TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING  
CONFERENCE CALL (TAC NOS. MC3857 AND MC3858)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on October 28, 2004, to Mr. Courtney Smyth, PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by the staff and to support a conference call with PSEG in order to clarify certain items in the licensee's submittal. This draft RAI is related to PSEG's submittal dated July 23, 2004, regarding an application requesting approval to modify the Technical Specification (TS) definition of OPERABLE and to modify the required actions for selected shutdown power TSs. Review of the RAI would allow PSEG to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

Enclosure: Draft Request for Additional Information

November 3, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Daniel S. Collins, Acting Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: G. Edward Miller, Project Engineer **/RA/**  
Project Directorate I, Section 2  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2,  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION (RAI) TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING  
CONFERENCE CALL (TAC NOS. MC3857 AND MC3858)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on October 28, 2004, to Mr. Courtney Smyth, PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by the staff and to support a conference call with PSEG in order to clarify certain items in the licensee's submittal. This draft RAI is related to PSEG's submittal dated July 23, 2004, regarding an application requesting approval to modify the Technical Specification (TS) definition of OPERABLE and to modify the required actions for selected shutdown power TSs. Review of the RAI would allow PSEG to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

Enclosure: Draft Request for Additional Information

DISTRIBUTION:

PDI-2 Rdg  
AGill

PUBLIC  
GMiller

MConception

Accession No.: ML043080264

|        |          |             |
|--------|----------|-------------|
| OFFICE | PDI-2/PE | PDI-2/SC(A) |
| NAME   | GMiller  | DCollins    |
| DATE   | 11/1/04  | 11/1/04     |

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENT REQUEST  
TO MODIFY TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION DEFINITION OF OPERABLE  
SALEM GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

By letter dated July 23, 2004, PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG) submitted a request for changes to the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (Salem), Technical Specifications (TSs). The proposed changes would modify the TS definition of operable, with respect to available power sources. Additionally, the proposed change would modify the TS action statements for shutdown AC and DC electrical power requirements. The NRC has developed the following draft questions during its review of the application. The questions do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the request.

1. In support of the change to the definition of OPERABLE, you state that the proposed change improves clarity, removes any potential confusion, and is consistent with the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ITS). Additionally, you state that the intent of your current TS 3.8.1.1 is to allow operation to be governed by the time limits of the Limiting Condition for Operation of the normal or emergency power source, rather than the corresponding action statement for each affected system or component (which would be allowed by the proposed change to the definition of OPERABLE). The proposed change to the definition of OPERABLE will affect all Technical Specifications, not just TS 3.8.1.1. Although it is not necessary to address the effect on each TS individually, the global effect this change would cause does need to be addressed.
2. Your submittal states that the LCOs for AC and DC sources and Distribution during Modes 5 and 6 and during movement of irradiated fuel assemblies are modified to be consistent with the intent of the ITS. The proposed required actions for LCO 3.8.1.2, Electrical Power - Shutdown, would state "With less than the above minimum required A.C. electrical power sources OPERABLE, immediately declare the affected required features inoperable, or suspend all operations involving CORE ALTERATIONS or positive reactivity changes until the minimum required A.C. electrical power sources are restored to OPERABLE status."

The ITS include an additional requirement of suspending the movement of irradiated fuel. Explain why this requirement has not been included in the action statement for 3.8.1.2.

ENCLOSURE

3. Pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.91(a) you provided your analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration using the standards in 10 CFR 50.92.

In support of your negative response to Question 1, you stated that the proposed changes would not modify the manner in which the plant is operated. The NRC staff believes that with less power systems required to be operable per the TSs, the manner in which the plant is operated will indeed be changed. Either provide a revised justification for this response, or explain how the proposed change will not modify the manner in which the plant is operated.